Remarks

The outstanding non-final Office Action mailed December 30, 2005, has been carefully considered. Claim 1 – 52 and 61 are pending. Specifically, claims 1 – 7, 9 – 32, 34 – 52, and 61 stand rejected, and claims 8 and 33 are objected to. By way of this Response with Amendments, claims 1, 7 – 9, 12, 13, 17, 20, 34, 42, and 61 are amended. In view of the amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Claim 1 was amended to include limitations of dependent claims 7 and 8 and further amended to delete limitations that were objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph.

Claims 7 and 8 were amended to delete limitations that were incorporated into amended claim 1.

Claim 9 was amended to include limitations of previously entered claim 1 and to correct antecedent basis problems in the previously entered claim 9.

Claim 12 was amended to correct antecedent basis problems in the previously entered claim 12.

Claim 13 was amended to correct antecedent basis problems in the previously entered claim 13.

Claim 17 was amended to correct antecedent basis problems in the previously entered claim 17.

Claim 20 was amended to further clarify the claimed invention.

Claim 34 was amended to include limitations of independent claim 26 and to correct antecedent basis problems in the previously entered claim 34.

Claim 42 was amended to correct antecedent basis problems in the previously entered claim 42.

Claim 61 was amended to correct an antecedent basis problem in the previously entered claim 61.

RESPONSE TO 35 U.S.C. § 112 REJECTIONS

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 .U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph. Specifically, the Office Action alleges that the limitation "the information obtained from the web site to create links in the user interface" is not fully supported in the specification. Applicant has amended claim 1 to delete the following two phrases: (1) "to transfer information obtained from a web site and stored in a local database in the handheld Internet appliance to the second local application" and (2) "programmed to store the information obtained from the web site to create the links in the user interface." In light of the aforementioned amendments to claim 1, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 .U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph, be withdrawn.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Applicant wishes to express his sincere appreciation for the Examiner's indication that claims 8 and 33 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant believes that claim 8 is allowable in light of the foregoing amendments to claim 1 and the following remarks, and Applicant believes that claim 33 is allowable in light of the following remarks.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 12 – 13 and 61 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph. Applicant has amended claims 12, 13 and 61 in the manner suggested and believes that claims 12, 13, and 61 are now in condition for allowance.

Furthermore, Applicant wishes to express his sincere appreciation for the Examiner's indication that dependent claims 9 – 11, 14 – 18, and 34 – 43 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph and to include all of the limitations their respective base claim and any intervening claims.

With regard to claim 9, Applicant has amended to claim 9 to include some of the limitations of previously entered claim 1, and Applicant believes that the included limitations from claim 1 were amended in a manner that Applicant believes corrects the 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, rejection of previously entered claim 1. In light of the amendments to claim 9, Applicant believes that amended claim 9 is now in condition for allowance and, consequently, claims 10, 11, and 14 – 16 that depend from claim 9 are also in condition for allowance.

With regard to claim 34, Applicant has amended claim 34 to include all of the limitations of its base claim and all intervening claim and amended claim 34 to correct the 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, rejection of claim 34. Applicant believes that 34 is in condition for allowance, and, consequently, claims 35 – 41 which depend therefrom are also in condition for allowance.

RESPONSE TO 35 U.S.C. §102 REJECTIONS

Claims 1 – 7, 19 – 32, and 44 - 52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Specifically, the Office Action alleges that claims 1 – 7, 19 – 32, and 44 - 52 are anticipated by *Smethers* (U.S. 6,463,304). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and requests reconsideration.

A proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that a single prior art reference disclose each element of the claim. *See, e.g., W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

Anticipation requires that each and every element of the claimed invention be disclosed in a single prior art reference. *See e.g., In re Paulsen*, 30 F.3d 1475, 31 USPQ 2d 1671 (Fed. Cir. 1994); *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 15 USPQ 2d 1655 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

I. Response to Rejection of Independent Claim 1

Applicant has amended claim 1, which is as follows:

A system for automatically accessing Internet information from a first local application on a handheld Internet appliance, the system comprising:

a software plug-in configured to automatically launch a second local application from the first local application, configured to automatically save information from a web site into a local database associated with the first local application, and **configured to create links to the second local application and the web site;**

a user interface in the first local application to enable a user to launch the second local application from the first local application, the user interface comprising a button to display a menu with links to the second local application; and

the local database having the automatically saved information from the web site stored therein. (Emphasis Added.)

Amended claim 1 includes the limitation of "a software plug-in ... configured to create links to the second local application and the web site." The aforementioned limitation was previously included in dependent claim 7. In the rejection of claim 7, the Office Action states:

> "the software plug-in has different routines to implement different purposes such as launching second local application (browser application from the first local application (launch application 400)." (See paragraph 13.)

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited reference apparently fails to disclose the claimed limitation. Applicant refers to FIGS. 4 – 6, each one of the figures illustrate "a flowchart of an application launch process" 400, 500, 600, respectively. (See Column 7, lines 3 -4; column 7, lines 34 – 35; and column 8, lines 51 – 52.) Applicant respectfully submits that for each of the "launch processes" there is no apparent indication of "creat[ing] **links to the second local application and the web site.**" Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

For at least the reason the independent claim 1 is allowable and that dependent claims include the limitations of their respective base claims, dependent claims 2 – 8, and 17 - 19 are also allowable. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

II. Response to Rejections of Dependent Claims 2 – 7 and 19

In addition to the aforementioned reason, Applicant believes that the dependent claims are distinctly patentable. Applicant does not believe that the reasons provided below are the only reasons for allowability of the dependent claims 2 – 7 and 19.

a. With regard to claim 3, claim 3 includes the limitation of "wherein the first local application and the second local application comprise ... a spreadsheet application." The Office Action relies upon *Smethers*, col. 4, lines 20 – 41, for disclosing the claimed limitation. Applicant has carefully read *Smethers* and cannot find the alleged disclosure. Applicant respectfully submits that *Smethers* fails to disclose the claimed limitation, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 3 be withdrawn.

b. With regard to claim 7, claim 7 includes the limitation of "wherein the software plug-in comprises software routines for ... replacing parameters associated with a data record of the first

local application on the web site's URL, the web site displaying information associated with the data record." The Office Action states the following:

> "[T]he software plug-in has different routines to implement different purposes such as launching second local application (browser application) from the first local application (launch application 400)." (See paragraph 13.)

Applicant has carefully read *Smethers* and Applicant respectfully submits that *Smethers* fails to disclose the claimed limitation. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 7 be withdrawn.

In the event that the rejection of claim 7 is maintained, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner point out with specificity where the reference allegedly discloses the claimed limitation.

III.   Response to Rejection of Claim 20

Claim 20 is as follows:

> A system for automatically accessing Internet information from a first local application on a handheld Internet appliance, the system comprising:
> a software plug-in to automatically launch a second local application and a web site from the first local application and **configured to create links to the second local application and the web sites using information in a database of the system;**
> a user interface in the first local application to enable a user to launch the second local application and the web site from the first local application, the user interface comprising a button to display a menu with links to the second local application and the web site, wherein the links ; and
> a database programmed to store the information required to create the links in the user interface, wherein the database comprises a plurality of data fields and a plurality of data records associated with the information required to create the links in the user interface and **the data fields comprise: an action type data field; an action name data field; an action context data field; an action URL data field; and an action application data field.** (Emphasis Added.)

Claim 20 includes the limitations of "a software plug-in ... configured to create links to the second local application and the web sites using information in a database of the system." Applicant respectfully submits that the cited reference apparently fails to disclose the claimed limitation. Applicant refers to FIGS. 4 – 6, each one of the figures illustrate "a flowchart of an application launch process" 400, 500, 600, respectively. (See Column 7, lines 3 -4; column 7,

lines 34 – 35; and column 8, lines 51 – 52.) Applicant respectfully submits that for each of the "launch processes" there is no apparent indication of "creat[ing] links to the second local application and the web site." Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 20 be withdrawn.

Furthermore, claim 20 includes the limitations of "configured to create links to the second local application and the web sites using information in a database of the system." Applicant respectfully submits that the cited reference fails to disclose the claimed limitations. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 20 be withdrawn.

In the event that the rejection of claim 20 is maintained, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner point out with specificity where the reference allegedly discloses the claimed limitations.

For at least the reason the independent claim 20 is allowable and that dependent claims include the limitations of their respective base claims, dependent claims 21 – 25 are also allowable. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

IV.   Response to Rejection of Claim 26

Claim 26 is as follows:

> A method for automatically launching a plurality of local applications and a plurality of web sites from an already open local application on a handheld Internet appliance, the method comprising:
>   **providing a software plug-in to** automatically launch the plurality of local applications and the plurality of web sites from the already open local application and to **obtain information required by the plurality of local applications and the plurality of web sites from another web site;**
>   providing a user interface in the already open local application to enable a user to launch the plurality of local applications and the plurality of web sites from the already open local application, the user interface comprising a button to display a menu with links to each of the local applications from the plurality of local applications and each of the web sites from the plurality of web sites; and
>   providing a database programmed to store the information required to create the links in the user interface. (Emphasis Added.)

Claim 26 includes the limitation of "providing a software plug-in to ... obtain information required by the plurality of local applications and the plurality of web sites *from another web site*." Applicant respectfully submits that the cited reference apparently fails to disclose at least

the aforementioned limitation. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 26 be withdrawn.

For at least the reason the independent claim 26 is allowable and that dependent claims include the limitations of their respective base claims, dependent claims 27 – 33 and 42 – 50 are also allowable. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

V.   Applicant's Response to Paragraph 14 of the Office Action

Statement of Law:

'**All words in a claim must be considered** in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.' *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970).

Statement of Rejection (Paragraph 14):

In paragraph 14, the Office states the following:

As to claims 20 – 32, 44 – 52, the claims are similar in scope to claims 1 – 7, and they are rejected under the same rationale.

Therefore, it can be seen from paragraphs 8 – 14 that Smethers anticipates claims 1 – 7, 19 – 32, and 44 – 52.

As a non-limiting example, independent claim 20 includes the limitation of

a database programmed to store the information required to create the links in the user interface, wherein the database comprises a plurality of data fields and a plurality of data records associated with the information required to create the links in the user interface and the data fields comprise: an action type data field; an action name data field; an action context data field; an action URL data field; and an action application data field.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 – 7 fail to include such a limitation.

As another non-limiting example, independent claim 51 includes the limitation of:

a software plug-in to automatically launch a second local application from an already launched local application and **to transfer from another website**, at least a portion of the information required by the second local application.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 – 7 fail to include such a limitation.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of claims 20 – 32 and 44 – 52 are improper as a matter of law for at least the reason that the aforementioned claims include limitations not found in claims 1 - 7. The stated rejection shows that the Examiner failed to consider all of the words in the claims when determining their patentability as required under

Wilson. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 20 – 32 and 44 – 52 be withdrawn.

In the event that the rejections of claims 20 – 32 and 44 – 52 are maintained, Applicant respectfully requests that the subsequent Office Action "properly communicate the basis for a rejection so that the issues can be identified early and [so that] the applicant can be given fair opportunity to reply," as required under MPEP 706.02(k).

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims 1 - 52 and 61 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 804 - 9080.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _Eric M. Ringer_
Eric M. Ringer
Reg. No. 47,028
Agent for Applicant

SMITH FROHWEIN TEMPEL GREENLEE BLAHA LLC
PO Box 88148
Atlanta, Georgia 30356
Voice (770) 804-9080